

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 9-23, 25-38, 40-56 and 58-63 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 11, 14-22, 26, 29-36, 38, 45-52, 54, 55, 62 and 63 have been amended. Claims 7, 8, 24, 39, 57, 64 and 65 were previously canceled.

In items 3-6 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 22, 31 and 55 have been rejected for failing to comply with the enablement requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. More specifically the Examiner states that the steps of "checking for an error ... and if an error is found" is not disclosed in the specification. The Examiner is directed to the specification of the instant application from page 18, line 16 to page 19, line 5, where it is described. More specifically this paragraph reads in part:

Similarly, during the transmission of a message, the control unit 13 is used for checking whether this message is correct. If an error is found during this process, the message stored in memory 14 is read out, after a certain period of time has elapsed, and is retransmitted (emphasis added).

Please note the words "checking" and "found" are indeed described in the specification.

Page 18, line 16 to page 19, line 5, describes two checks. First, it is checked whether the respective bus section is free to transmit (page 18, lines 16-19). Second, the message to be transmitted is read out from memory 14 and transmitted. The control device 13 checks the transmitted message with the stored message. If the check fails, an error is recorded and the message is retransmitted after a given delay (page 18, lines 19-26). Simply put, this is clearly described in the specification.

Claim 1 recites:

said control device of said transceivers being constructed such that, when an operation is being performed to transmit at least one of the first ones of the communication information and the second ones of the communication information, said control device of said transceivers checking for an error and if the error is found, said control device of said transceivers, after a given delay time, causing an operation to be performed to retransmitting at least one of the first ones of the communication information and the second ones of the communication information via a transmitter that is selected from the group consisting of said first transmitter and said second transmitter;

This language recites that the control device checks the transmitted message and retransmits the message if an error is detected in the transmission. Claims 22, 31 and 55 repeat nearly identical language. We hope this explanation clears up this issue.

In items 9-14 on pages 3-4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1-6, 9-23, 25-38, 40-56 and 58-63 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In item 10, the Examiner states that there is no antecedent basis for the limitation of "the communication information" recited in claim 1, lines 13-14 page 4 and lines 6, 11, 15 on page 15. The Examiner is directed to page 2, lines 4-5 that recites "communication information" and therefore provides proper antecedent basis. Further it is noted that the "communication information" includes the first ones of the communication information and the second ones of the communication information. Please note that the claim language is first ones of **the** communication information. The language is simply stating that some (first ones) of the communication information is transmitted clockwise and some (second ones) of the communication information is transmitted counterclockwise. Put another way, whatever the control device does to the communication information it is the same whether it is the first ones of the communication information or the second ones of the communication information because its all communication information. We trust this clears up this issue.

In item 11, the Examiner states that there is no antecedent basis for the recitation of "communication information" in claim 9. The Examiner is directed to page 9, lines 2-3 of claim 9 which recites "communication information" and therefore provides proper antecedent basis. As noted above, the communication information includes both the first and second ones of the communication information.

In item 12, the Examiner states that the use of the terms "retransmitting" and "forwarding" is confusing. The term forwarding has been deleted throughout the claim language.

In item 13, the Examiner states that when describing the functions of the control device, it is necessary to specify which of the four transceivers is involved. All of the control devices and for that matter all of the transceivers are identical and therefore they all do the same functions. Please note that these are apparatus type claims. However, the claims have been amended to be more specific but we feel this further unnecessarily lengthens the claims.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for clarification or cosmetic reasons. The changes are neither provided for

overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claim for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In item 15 the Examiner notes that in claim 1, the term "retransmitting" should be replaced by "retransmit". Claim 1 has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion.

If there are anymore claim issues, a call to the undersigned would be appreciated to resolve any outstanding issues.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6, 9-23, 25-38, 40-56 and 58-63 are solicited.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ralph E. Locher/
Ralph E. Locher
Reg. No. 41,947

January 30, 2008
Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101